

SLOVENSKI STANDARD kSIST-TP FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021 01-maj-2021

Vesoljska tehnika - Priročnik za toplotno zasnovo - 4. del: Konduktivni prenos toplote

Space Engineering - Thermal design handbook - Part 4: Conductive Heat Transfer

Raumfahrttechnik - Handbuch für thermisches Design - Teil 4: Konduktive Wärmeübertragung

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW

Ingénierie spatiale - Manuel de conception thermique - Partie 4: Transfert de chaleur par conduction thermique

kSIST-TP FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021

Ta slovenski standard je istoveten z log/stan FprcEN/CLC/TR-17603-31-04

ICS:

49.140 Vesoljski sistemi in operacije Space systems and operations

kSIST-TP FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31- en,fr,de 04:2021

kSIST-TP FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW (standards.iteh.ai)

kSIST-TP FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021 https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/dccddf42-2f15-447b-9c05-077c2ca716f3/ksist-tp-fprcen-clc-tr-17603-31-04-2021

TECHNICAL REPORT RAPPORT TECHNIQUE TECHNISCHER BERICHT

FINAL DRAFT FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04

February 2021

ICS 49.140

English version

Space Engineering - Thermal design handbook - Part 4: Conductive Heat Transfer

Ingénierie spatiale - Manuel de conception thermique -Partie 4: Transfert de chaleur par conduction thermique

Raumfahrttechnik - Handbuch für thermisches Design -Teil 4: Konduktive Wärmeübertragung

This draft Technical Report is submitted to CEN members for Vote. It has been drawn up by the Technical Committee CEN/CLC/JTC 5.

CEN and CENELEC members are the national standards bodies and national electrotechnical committees of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of North Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and United Kingdom.

Recipients of this draft are invited to submit, with their comments, notification of any relevant patent rights of which they are aware and to provide supporting documentation. ksist-tp-fprcen-clc-tr-17603-31-04-2021

Warning: This document is not a Technical Report. It is distributed for review and comments. It is subject to change without notice and shall not be referred to as a Technical Report.





CEN-CENELEC Management Centre: Rue de la Science 23, B-1040 Brussels

Table of contents

Europ	ean For	eword	10
1 Sco	pe		11
2 Refe	erences		12
3 Tern	ns, defiı	nitions and symbols	13
3.1	Terms	and definitions	13
3.2	Abbrev	riated terms	13
3.3	Symbo	ls	13
4 Con	ductive	shape factors	15
4.1	Genera	iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW	15
4.2	Planar-	planar surfaces	16
	4.2.1	planar surfaces (Standards.iteh.ai) Two-dimensional configurations	16
4.3		surface-cylindrical surface VCLC/TR 17603-31-042021	18
	4.3.1	https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/dccddf42-2f15-447b-9c05- Two-dimensional configurations	18
	4.3.2	Axisymmetrical configuration	
4.4	Planar	surface-spherical surface	23
	4.4.1	Plane and sphere	23
4.5	Cylindr	ical-cylindrical surfaces	25
	4.5.1	Two-dimensional configurations	25
4.6	Spheric	cal-spherical surfaces	41
	4.6.1	Two concentric spheres	41
5 The	rmal joiı	nt conductance	43
5.1	Genera	al	43
	5.1.1	Empirical correlations	44
	5.1.2	Thermal interface materials	48
	5.1.3	Joint geometries	50
5.2	Bare m	netallic joints	51
	5.2.1	Metal-metal joints	62
	5.2.2	Metal-composite joints	94
	5.2.3	Composite-composite joints	96

5.3	Interfac	cial materials between metals	98
	5.3.1	Metallic foils between metals	98
	5.3.2	Metallic oxide powders between similar metals	109
	5.3.3	Porous metallic materials between similar metals.	109
	5.3.4	Insulating spacers between similar metals	119
	5.3.5	Fluids between metals	133
	5.3.6	Elastomeric spacers between similar metals	142
5.4	Outgas	sing data	151
Bibliog	graphy.		.153
Figure	S		
Figure 4		res of the conductive shape factor per unit length, <i>S/L</i> , vs. the ensionless width of the strip, <i>X</i> . Calculated by the compiler	17
Figure 4		les of the conductive shape factor per unit length, S/L, vs. X for different es of Y. Calculated by the compiler	19
Figure 4	dime	les of the conductive shape factor per unit length, S/L, vs. ensionless diameter of the cylinder cross section. Calculated by the	20
Figure 4	4-4: Valu	piler	
Figure 4	1-5: Valu	les of the dimensionless conductive shape factor, S/D, vs. the ensionless diameter of the sphere, Z, Calculated by the compiler	
Figure 4	ho; fo	res of the conductive shape factor per unit length, S/L, vs. radius ratio, or different values of the dimensionless distance between cylinder axes, alculated by the compiler	26
Figure 4	vs. t	les of the dimensionless conductive shape factors per unit length, S_{ij}/L , he eccentricity of one of the holes X_2 , for different values of the relevant metrical parameters. From Faulkner & Andrews (1955) [13]	28
Figure 4	dian	les of the conductive shape factors per unit length, S_{ij}/L , vs. the neter ratio d_3 , for different values of the relevant geometric parameters. In Faulkner & Andrews (1955) [13]	30
Figure 4	dime	les of the conductive shape factor per unit length, S/L, vs. the ensionless characteristic length of the holes, X. Calculated by the piler.	32
Figure ²	dime	lues of the conductive shape factor per unit length, S/L, vs. the ensionless diameter of the hole, X, for several values of the aspect y, Y, of the rectangular bar cross-section. Calculated by the compiler	34
Figure 4	dime ratio	lues of the conductive shape factor per unit length, <i>S/L</i> , vs. the ensionless diameter of the hole, <i>X</i> , for different values of the aspect y, Y, of the rectangular bar cross section. After Griggs, Pitts & Goyal (3) [25]	36
Figure 4		lues of the conductive shape factor per unit length, <i>S/L</i> , vs. the ensionless diameter of the hole, <i>X</i> , for several values of the aspect	

	ratio, Y, of the rectangular bar cross section. After Griggs, Pitts & Goyal (1973) [25]	38
Figure 4-13	3: Values of the conductive shape factor per unit length, S/L , vs. the dimensionless hole radius, ρ , for several values of n . Calculated by the compiler.	40
Figure 4-14	4: Values of the dimensionless conductive shape factor, S/r_1 , vs. radius ratio, ρ . Calculated by the compiler.	42
Figure 5-1:	Estimation of the temperature drop at the interface.	43
Figure 5-2:	Variation of gap thickness parameter, δ_o , with contact surface parameter, d . After Fletcher & Gyorog (1970) [17]	45
Figure 5-3:	Variation of contact conductance with apparent interface pressure. After Fletcher & Gyorog (1970) [17]	46
Figure 5-4:	Dimensionless conductance vs. dimensionless load. Stainless steel under vacuum conditions. From Thomas & Probert (1972) [47]	47
Figure 5-5:	Dimensionless conductance vs. dimensionless load. Stainless steel under vacuum conditions. From Thomas & Probert (1972) [47]	48
Figure 5-6:	Schematic representation of two surfaces in contact and heat flow across the interface.	48
Figure 5-7:	Interface material compressed between two contacting surfaces	49
Figure 5-8:	Plots of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for two different surface finishes. From Fried & Kelley (1966) [24]	51
Figure 5-9:	Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for two different surface finishes. From Fried & Atkins (1965) [23]	52
Figure 5-10	D: Plots of contact conductance/vs. contact pressure for two different surface finishes. From Fried (1966) [22] quoted by Scollon & Carpitella (1970) [43]	53
Figure 5-1	Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different ambient pressures. From Fried & Kelley (1966) [24]	54
Figure 5-12	2: Plots of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes and ambient pressures. Circle: From Fried & Atkins (1965) [23]. Square: From Fried (1966) [21] quoted by Scollon & Carpitella (1970) [43]	55
Figure 5-13	3: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes. From Clausing & Chao (1965) [7]	56
Figure 5-14	4: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes. From Fried & Atkins (1965) [23]	57
Figure 5-1	5: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for various surface finishes, mean temperatures and ambient pressures. Circle, square and rhombus: from Clausing & Chao (1965) [7]. Triangle: from Fried (1966) [21] quoted by Scollon & Carpitella (1970) [43].	58
Figure 5-16	6: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. Notice the directional effect on contact conductance. From Fried & Kelley (1966) [24]	59
Figure 5-17	7: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes. Circle and square: from Fried (1965) [21]. Rhombus and triangle: from Fried & Atkins (1965) [23]. Inverted triangle and right-oriented triangle:	60
	from Fried & Kelley (1966) [24]	60

Figure 5-18	8: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes. Circle: From Fried (1966) [22] quoted by Scollon & Carpitella (1970) [43]. Square: From Gyorog (1970) [26]	61
Figure 5-19	9: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes. From Fried (1966) [21] quoted by Scollon & Carpitella (1970) [43]	62
Figure 5-20	0: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes: smooth surfaces. White square: from Padgett & Fletcher (1982) [35]. Black square: from Padgett & Fletcher (1982) [35]. Black triangle: from Fletcher & Gygorg (1971) [17]. Circle: from Clausing & Chao (1963) [7]	63
Figure 5-2°	1: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes: medium surfaces. White square: from Padgett & Fletcher (1982) [35]. Black square: from Padgett & Fletcher (1982) [35]. Black triangle: from Fletcher & Gygorg (1971) [17]. Circle: from Clausing & Chao (1963) [7]	64
Figure 5-22	2: Experimental values of thermal contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Marchetti, Testa & Torrisi (1988) [31]	65
Figure 5-23	3: Experimental values of thermal contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Marchetti, Testa & Torrisi (1988) [31]	66
Figure 5-24	4: 0,1 µm brass sample pair applied force comparison. Dashed line: 112 N; dashed-dotted line: 224 N; long-short dashed line: 336 N; long-double short dashed line: 448 N; dashed-triple dotted line: 560 N; solid line: 670 N	67
Figure 5-2	5: 0,2 µm brass sample pair applied force comparison	67
Figure 5-26	6: 0,4 µm brass sample pair applied force comparison	68
Figure 5-27	7: 0,8 µm brass sample pair applied force comparison	68
Figure 5-28	8: 1,6 µm brass sample pair applied force comparison	69
Figure 5-29	9: Brass sample pairs, 4,2 K surface finish comparison. Short dashed line: 0,1 μm; long dashed line: 0,2 μm; dashed-dotted line: 0,4 μm; long-short dashed line: 0,8 μm; long-double short dashed line: 1,6 μm	69
Figure 5-30	0: Brass sample pairs, 4,2 K surface finish comparison. Long-double short dashed line: 112 N; short dashed line: 224 N; dashed-dotted line: 336 N; dotted line: 448 N; long dashed line: 560 N; solid line: 670 N	70
Figure 5-3°	1: γ copper sample pairs, 4,2 K surface finish comparison. Key as in Figure 5-30	71
Figure 5-32	2: Physical model of two rotating cylinders contacted to each other	71
Figure 5-33	3: Contact thermal resistance after applied high contact pressure vs. rotating speed	72
Figure 5-34	4: Contact thermal resistance after applied high contact pressure vs. rotating speed	73
Figure 5-3	5: Thermal contact conductance as a function of position for: (a) 4 x 6 load array; (b) 5 x 7 load array; c) 6 x 8 load array. From Peterson and Fletcher (1992) [37]	75
Figure 5-36	6: Integrated thermal contact conductance. From Table 5-2	76
_	7: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. Notice the directional effect on contact conductance. From Fried & Kelley (1966) [24]	
Figure 5-38	8: Thermal contact conductance vs. interfacial pressure for Al 2024-T4/SS 304 contacts: experimental data and theoretical results	

T4/Zircaloy-2 contacts: experimental data and theoretical results	79
Figure 5-40: Thermal contact conductance vs. interfacial pressure for SS 304/Zircaloy- 2 contacts: experimental data and theoretical results	80
Figure 5-41: Thermal contact conductance vs. interfacial pressure for Mg AZ31B/zircaloy-2 contacts: experimental data and theoretical results	81
Figure 5-42: Thermal contact conductance vs. interfacial pressure for Brass 271/Zircaloy-2 contacts: experimental data and theoretical results	82
Figure 5-43: Variation of contact conductance with apparent interface pressure for Al 2024-T4/SS 304 metal surfaces at different mean junction temperatures	83
Figure 5-44: Thermal contact conductance vs. contact pressure. Theoretical curve: $h_c = KP^{0,93}$. (1) SS-AI, $K = 3,27 \times 10^{-11}$. (2) SS-Cu, $K = 1,84 \times 10^{-11}$	84
Figure 5-45: Comparison between experimental and theoretical values for SS/AI interface. Theoretical curve: $h_c = 3,65 \times 10^{-9} P^{0,66}$	84
Figure 5-46: Comparison between experimental and theoretical values for SS/Cu interface	85
Figure 5-47: Comparison between experimental and theoretical values for SS/AI interface.	85
Figure 5-48: Thermal contact resistance vs. applied pressure for SS to Cu specimens (RMS roughness values as indicated)	86
Figure 5-49: Thermal contact resistance vs. applied pressure for Cu to SS (RMS roughness values as indicated). r.d.s., i.t.e.h., a.i.	87
Figure 5-50: Dimensionless correlation of contact resistances between machined SS specimens pressed against copper optical flats (surface finishes of the SS specimens as indicated) catalog standards/sist/decddf42-2f15-447b-9c05-	88
077c2ca716f3/ksist-tp-fprcen-clc-tr-17603-31-04-2021 Figure 5-51: Dimensionless correlation as for Figure 5-50 but for different surface finishes of the SS specimens.	89
Figure 5-52: Overall thermal conductance as a function of apparent contact pressure and mean junction temperature	91
Figure 5-53: Joint Configuration.	92
Figure 5-54: Thermal contact conductance as a function of distance from center of bolt. From Peterson, Stanks & Fletcher (1991) [39]	92
Figure 5-55: Integrated thermal contact conductance. From Table 5-4	93
Figure 5-56: Stainless-steel and Graphite-epoxi-laminate	
Figure 5-57: Stainless-steel and glass-epoxi-laminate	94
Figure 5-58: Experimental values of thermal transverse conductivity a) Graphite-epoxi-laminate	96
Figure 5-59: Graphite-epoxi-laminate and graphite-epoxi-laminate	97
Figure 5-60: Glass-epoxi-laminate and glass-epoxi-laminate	
Figure 5-61: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Cunnington (1964)	
[9]	98
Figure 5-62: Loading resistance with tin.	99
Figure 5-63: Unloading resistance with tin	99

Figure 5-64: Loading resistance with lead.	100
Figure 5-65: Unloading resistance with lead	100
Figure 5-66: Loading resistance with aluminium	101
Figure 5-67: Unloading resistance with aluminium	101
Figure 5-68: Loading resistance with copper.	102
Figure 5-69: Unloading resistance with copper	102
Figure 5-70: Dimensionless minimum resistance to bare joint resistance	103
Figure 5-71: Dimensionless thermal contact conductance for specimen sets 1, 2 and 3 as a function of the distance from a load point. $P_{\text{contact}} = 689,5 \times 10^3 \text{Pa}$. Values for h_{uncoated} from Table 5-1 (clause 5.2.1.1). From Peterson and Fletcher (1992) [37].	104
Figure 5-72: Thermal contact conductance variation: a) 0,79 N.m; b) 1,92 N.m; c) 3,04 N.m. From Peterson & Fletcher (1991) [37]	107
Figure 5-73: Integrated thermal contact conductance. From Table 5-6	108
Figure 5-74: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes and mean temperatures. From Miller & Fletcher (1973) [32]	110
Figure 5-75: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for different surface finishes and mean temperatures. From Miller & Fletcher (1973) [32]	111
Figure 5-76: Plot of contact conductance vs./contact pressure for different porosities. From Miller & Fletcher (1973) [32]	112
Figure 5-77: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Gyorog (1970) [26]	113
Figure 5-78: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure filtering Gyorog (1970) [26]077c2ca716B/ksist-tp-fprcen-clc-tr-17603-31-04-2021	114
Figure 5-79: Comparison of thermal conductance of fiber metals with aluminium bare junction conductance, $T_m = 307 \text{ K.}$	
Figure 5-80: Comparison of thermal conductance of powder metals with aluminium bare junction conductance, T_m = 342 K	116
Figure 5-81: Effect of surface finish on thermal conductance with a porous copper interstitial material.	117
Figure 5-82: Effect of mean junction temperature on thermal conductance with a porous copper interstitial material	117
Figure 5-83: Dimensionless effectiveness parameter for porous metals and selected thermal control materials	118
Figure 5-84: Effects of surface finish and temperature conductance with a porous nickel interstitial material.	118
Figure 5-85: Effects of mean junction temperature on thermal conductance with a porous copper interstitial material	119
Figure 5-86: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Fletcher, Smuda & Gyorog (1969) [20]	120
Figure 5-87: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Fletcher, Smuda & Gyorog (1969) [20]	121

Gyorog (1969) [20]	.122
Figure 5-89: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Fletcher, Smuda & Gyorog (1969) [20]	.123
Figure 5-90: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Fletcher, Smuda & Gyorog (1969) [20]	.124
Figure 5-91: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Fletcher, Smuda & Gyorog (1969) [20]	.126
Figure 5-92: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Gyorog (1970) [26]	.127
Figure 5-93: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Fletcher, Smuda & Gyorog (1969) [20]	.128
Figure 5-94: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Fletcher, Smuda & Gyorog (1969) [20]	.129
Figure 5-95: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Fletcher, Smuda & Gyorog (1969) [20]	.130
Figure 5-96: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Fletcher, Smuda & Gyorog (1969) [20]	.131
Figure 5-97: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Gyorog (1970) [26][26]	.132
[26]	.133
Figure 5-99: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure. From Cunnington (1964) [9]	.134
(1964) [9]	
Figure 5-101: Photograph of segmented surface test specimen	.135
Figure 5-102: Thermal contact resistance values for Al 6061-T6 with and without segmented surface interstitial material (one atmosphere)	.136
Figure 5-103: Comparison between models and experimental results for SS1 and SS2	.138
Figure 5-104: Comparison between models and experimental results for SS1 and SS2	.139
Figure 5-105: Comparison between models and experimental results for SS3 and SS4	.139
Figure 5-106: Comparison between models and experimental results for SS3 and SS4	.140
Figure 5-107: Effect of variation of initial contact pressure on joint resistance for the edge tube/fin system. $h_o = 0$, $h_e = 0$, $P_i = 0$, $P_o = 0$, $T_i = 313$ K, $T_o = 293$ K, $T_i = 373$ K, $T_o = 293$ K.	.142
Figure 5-108: Plot of contact conductance vs. contact pressure for various elastomeric materials at two mean temperatures. From Fletcher & Miller (1973) [18]	.144
Tables	
Table 5-1: Load configuration thermal contact conductance data	74
Table 5-2: Integrated load configuration test thermal contact conductance values	76
Table 5-3: Parameters of Samples Used in Tests Shown in Figure 5-43	83

kSIST-TP FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021

FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021 (E)

Table 5-4: Integrated thermal contact conductance values.	92
Table 5-5: Thermal contact conductance data	.106
Table 5-6: Integrated thermal contact conductance values.	.108
Table 5-7: Values of contact conductance vs. contact pressure	.109
Table 5-8: Values of contact conductance as a function of contact pressure and mean temperature	. 125
Table 5-9: Values of contact conductance as a function of contact pressure and mean temperature	129
Table 5-10: Values of contact conductance as a function of contact pressure and mean temperature	132
Table 5-11: Outgassing Data of Several Materials	. 151

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW (standards.iteh.ai)

kSIST-TP FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021 https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/dccddf42-2f15-447b-9c05-077c2ca716f3/ksist-tp-fprcen-clc-tr-17603-31-04-2021

European Foreword

This document (FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021) has been prepared by Technical Committee CEN/CLC/JTC 5 "Space", the secretariat of which is held by DIN.

This document is currently submitted to the Vote on TR.

It is highlighted that this technical report does not contain any requirement but only collection of data or descriptions and guidelines about how to organize and perform the work in support of EN 16603-31

This Technical report (FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021) originates from ECSS-E-HB-31-01 Part 4A.

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. CEN [and/or CENELEC] shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

This document has been prepared under a mandate given to CEN by the European Commission and the European Free Trade Association.

This document has been developed to cover specifically space systems and has therefore precedence over any TR covering the same scope but with a wider domain of applicability (e.g.: aerospace).

This document is currently submitted to the CEN CONSULTATION.447b-9c05-

077c2ca716f3/ksist-tp-fprcen-clc-tr-17603-31-04-2021

1 Scope

This Part 4 of the spacecraft thermal control and design data handbooks, provides information on calculating the conductive heat transfer rate for a variety of two and three-dimensional configurations.

Calculations for the conductance of the interface between two surfaces (joints) require special consideration and are included as a separate clause.

The Thermal design handbook is published in 16 Parts

TR 17603-31-01	Thermal design handbook – Part 1: View factors
TR 17603-31-02	Thermal design handbook – Part 2: Holes, Grooves and Cavities
TR 17603-31-03	Ten Thermal design handbook - Fart 3: Spacecraft/Surface Temperature
TR 17603-31-04	Thermal design handbook - Part 4: Conductive Heat Transfer
TR 17603-31-05	Thermal design handbook – Part 5: Structural Materials: Metallic and kComposite CEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021 https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/dccddf42-2f15-447b-9c05-
TR 17603-31-06	077cThermal design handbook FPart 6: Thermal Control Surfaces
TR 17603-31-07	Thermal design handbook – Part 7: Insulations
TR 17603-31-08	Thermal design handbook – Part 8: Heat Pipes
TR 17603-31-09	Thermal design handbook – Part 9: Radiators
TR 17603-31-10	Thermal design handbook – Part 10: Phase – Change Capacitors
TR 17603-31-11	Thermal design handbook – Part 11: Electrical Heating
TR 17603-31-12	Thermal design handbook – Part 12: Louvers
TR 17603-31-13	Thermal design handbook – Part 13: Fluid Loops
TR 17603-31-14	Thermal design handbook – Part 14: Cryogenic Cooling
TR 17603-31-15	Thermal design handbook – Part 15: Existing Satellites
TR 17603-31-16	Thermal design handbook – Part 16: Thermal Protection System

2 References

EN Reference	Reference in text	Title
EN 16601-00-01	ECSS-S-ST-00-01	ECSS System - Glossary of terms

All other references made to publications in this Part are listed, alphabetically, in the **Bibliography**.

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW (standards.iteh.ai)

kSIST-TP FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021 https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/dccddf42-2f15-447b-9c05-077c2ca716f3/ksist-tp-fprcen-clc-tr-17603-31-04-2021

Terms, definitions and symbols

3.1 Terms and definitions

For the purpose of this Standard, the terms and definitions given in ECSS-S-ST-00-01 apply.

3.2 Abbreviated terms

The following abbreviated terms are defined and used within this Standard.

roughness deviation, [m]

roughness deviation, [m]

(standards.iten.ai)

TWL total weight loss, percent

kSIST-TP FprCEN/CLC/TR 17603-31-04:2021

httpVCMdards.iten.ai/catalog/svolatile/condensable/materials/percent by weight

077c2ca716f3/ksist-tp-fprcen-clc-tr-17603-31-04-2021

Other symbols, mainly used to define the geometry of the configuration, are introduced when required.

3.3 Symbols

A	[m ²]
E	modulus of elasticity, [Pa]
L	length normal to the plane of the figure in two- dimensional configurations, [m]
M	surface hardness, [Pa]
P	applied compressive load, also called contact pressure, [Pa]
O	heat transfer rate, [W]